

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application Serial No.	09/817,808
Confirmation No.	8368
.....	
Filing Date	3/26/2001
Inventorship	McCartney
Appellant.....	Microsoft Corporation
Group Art Unit.....	2143
Examiner	Shin, Kyung
Attorney's Docket No.	MS1-784US
Title: METHODS AND SYSTEMS FOR PROCESSING MEDIA CONTENT	

REPLY BRIEF

To: Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

From: Kristina M. Kuhnert (Tel. 509-324-9256; Fax 509-323-8979)
Customer No. 22801
Lee & Hayes, PLLC
421 W. Riverside Ave., Suite 500
Spokane, WA 99201

In response to Examiner's Answer dated June 23, 2008, in connection with
Appellant's Appeal Brief filed February 25, 2008, a Reply Brief pursuant to 37 C.F.R.
§41.41 is submitted. Appellant respectfully requests favorable consideration.

Status of Claims

Claims 1-19, 21-27, 29-47, 51, 55-62, and 69-76 stand rejected and are pending in the application.

Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

Appellant recognizes that the statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal were not correct in the Appeal Brief filed on February 25, 2008. The grounds of rejection are correct as stated in the Examiner's answer mailed June 23, 2008 and as stated below.

Claims 1-19, 21-27, 39-47, 56-62 and 69-71 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent Application No. 2001/0031066 to Meyer et al. ("Meyer") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,549,922 to Srivastava et al. ("Srivastava").

Claims 29-34 and 36-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,553,379 to Jaeger et al. ("Jaeger") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,748 to Suganuma ("Suganuma").

Claims 35, 51, and 55 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Jaeger in view of Suganuma, and further in view of Srivastava.

Claims 72-76 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,345,257 to Milsted et al. ("Milsted").

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In the Examiner's Answer, the stated rejections of claims 1-19, 21-27, 39-47, 56-62 and 69-71 are similar or the same as those provided in the Non Final Office Action of January 30, 2007. Appellant fully addressed these rejections in Appellant's Appeal Brief. In the interest of brevity, Appellant will not repeat Appellant's arguments from the Appeal Brief.

Claims Rejected Over Meyer in view of Srivastava

Independent claim 1 recites a method of processing media content comprising:

receiving a physical ID that corresponds to a specific media upon which content resides that can be experienced by a user;

attempting to map the physical ID to a logical ID;

if no logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, attempting to establish a logical ID for the physical ID by causing a Wizard user interface (UI) to be presented to a user via a client computer so that information pertaining to the user's specific media can be collected from the user; and

if a logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, searching a database that contains metadata associated with the specific media by using the logical ID as a basis for a search query, wherein different instances of a specific media with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to the same logical ID.

Appellant respectfully reiterates all arguments in favor of allowance of independent claim 1 as made in the Appeal Brief. No admission is made with

respect to any assertions put forth within the Examiner's Answer not addressed herein. Appellant further argues as follows in view of the Examiner's Answer.

Appellant, therefore, respectfully submits that the Office fails to establish that the cited prior art references disclose the claimed subject matter for at least the reasons discussed within the Appeal Brief.

Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 1, are neither shown nor suggested by the references of record either singly or in permissible combination with one another.

Independent claim 8 recites a server comprising:

one or more processors;

one or more storage devices; and

software code resident on the one or more storage devices which, when executed by the one or more processors, cause the processors to:

receive a physical ID that corresponds to a specific media upon which content resides that can be experienced by a user;

attempt to map the physical ID to a logical ID;

if no logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, attempt to establish a logical ID for the physical ID by causing a Wizard user interface (UI) to be presented to a user via a client computer so that information pertaining to the user's specific media can be collected from the user;

if a logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, search a database that contains metadata associated with the specific media by using the logical ID as a basis for a search query;

format the metadata in a XML schema; and

return the formatted metadata to a client, wherein different instances of a specific media with the same content thereon are associated with different

physical IDs that are mappable to the same logical ID.

Appellant respectfully reiterates all arguments in favor of allowance of independent claim 8 as made in the Appeal Brief. No admission is made with respect to any assertions put forth within the Examiner's Answer not addressed herein. Appellant, therefore, respectfully submits that the Office fails to establish that the cited prior art references disclose the claimed subject matter for at least the reasons discussed within the Appeal Brief.

Independent claim 9 recites one or more computer-readable media having computer-readable instructions thereon which, when executed by a computer, cause the computer to:

receive a physical ID that corresponds to a specific media upon which content resides that can be experienced by a user;

attempt to map the physical ID to a logical ID;

if no logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, attempt to establish a logical ID for the physical ID by causing a user interface (UI) to be presented to a user via a client computer so that information pertaining to the user's specific media can be collected from the user;

if a logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, search a database that contains metadata associated with the specific media by using the logical ID as a basis for a search query;

format the metadata in a XML schema; and

return the formatted metadata to a client, wherein different instances of a specific media with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to the same logical ID.

Appellant respectfully reiterates all arguments in favor of allowance of independent claim 9 as made in the Appeal Brief. No admission is made with respect to any assertions put forth within the Examiner's Answer not addressed

herein. Appellant, therefore, respectfully submits that the Office fails to establish that the cited prior art references disclose the claimed subject matter for at least the reasons discussed within the Appeal Brief.

Independent claim 10 recites a method of processing media content comprising:

attempting to map a physical ID to a logical ID, the physical ID corresponding to a specific media associated with content that can be experienced by a user;

if no logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, attempting to establish a logical ID for the physical ID by causing a user interface (UI) to be presented to a user via a client computer so that information pertaining to the user's specific media can be collected from the user;

if a logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, using the logical ID to query one or more databases that contain metadata associated with the specific media; and

returning metadata associated with the specific media to a client, wherein different instances of a specific media with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to the same logical ID.

Appellant respectfully reiterates all arguments in favor of allowance of independent claim 10 as made in the Appeal Brief. No admission is made with respect to any assertions put forth within the Examiner's Answer not addressed herein. Appellant, therefore, respectfully submits that the Office fails to establish that the cited prior art references disclose the claimed subject matter for at least the reasons discussed within the Appeal Brief.

Claims 11-18 depends from claim 10 and is allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. This claim is also allowable for its own recited features

which, in combination with those recited in claim 10, are neither shown nor suggested by the references of record either singly or in permissible combination with one another.

Independent claim 19 recites a method of processing media content comprising:

receiving a physical ID that corresponds to a specific media associated with content that can be experienced by a user;

attempting to map the physical ID to a logical ID;

if a logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, searching a database that contains metadata associated with the specific media by using the logical ID as a basis for a search query;

if no logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, attempting to establish a logical ID for the physical ID by causing a user interface (UI) to be presented to a user via a client computer so that information pertaining to the user's specific media can be collected from the user, wherein different instances of a specific media with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to the same logical ID.

Appellant respectfully reiterates all arguments in favor of allowance of independent claim 19 as made in the Appeal Brief. No admission is made with respect to any assertions put forth within the Examiner's Answer not addressed herein. Appellant, therefore, respectfully submits that the Office fails to establish that the cited prior art references disclose the claimed subject matter for at least the reasons discussed within the Appeal Brief.

Claims 21-26 depend from claim 19 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited

features which, in combination with those recited in claim 19, are neither shown nor suggested by the references of record either singly or in permissible combination with one another.

Independent claim 27 recites a server computer comprising:

- one or more processors;
- one or more storage devices; and
- software code resident on the one or more storage devices which, when executed by the one or more processors, cause the processors to:
 - receive a physical ID that corresponds to a specific media upon which content resides that can be experienced by a user;
 - attempt to map the physical ID to a logical ID;
 - if a logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, search a database that contains metadata associated with the specific media by using the logical ID as a basis for a search query; and
 - if no logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, attempt to establish a logical ID for the physical ID by causing a Wizard user interface (UI) to be presented to a user via a client computer so that information pertaining to the user's specific media can be collected from the user, wherein different instances of a specific media with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to the same logical ID.

Appellant respectfully reiterates all arguments in favor of allowance of independent claim 27 as made in the Appeal Brief. No admission is made with respect to any assertions put forth within the Examiner's Answer not addressed herein. Appellant, therefore, respectfully submits that the Office fails to establish that the cited prior art references disclose the claimed subject matter for at least the reasons discussed within the Appeal Brief.

Independent claim 39 recites a method of processing media content comprising:

receiving a physical ID that corresponds to a specific media upon which content resides that can be experienced by a user;

attempting to map the physical ID to a logical ID, the logical ID serving as a basis for a search query of a database that contains metadata associated with the specific media;

if no logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, attempting to establish a logical ID for the physical ID by causing a Wizard user interface (UI) to be presented to a user via a client computer so that information pertaining to the user's specific media can be collected from the user, wherein different instances of a specific media with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to the same logical ID.

Appellant respectfully reiterates all arguments in favor of allowance of independent claim 39 as made in the Appeal Brief. No admission is made with respect to any assertions put forth within the Examiner's Answer not addressed herein. Appellant, therefore, respectfully submits that the Office fails to establish that the cited prior art references disclose the claimed subject matter for at least the reasons discussed within the Appeal Brief.

Claims 40-46 depend from claim 39 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 39, are neither shown nor suggested by the references of record either singly or in permissible combination with one another.

Independent claim 47 recites one or more computer-readable media having computer-readable instructions thereon which, when executed by a computer, cause the computer to:

receive a physical ID that corresponds to a specific media upon which content resides that can be experienced by a user;

attempt to map the physical ID to a logical ID, the logical ID serving as a basis for a search query of a database that contains metadata associated with the specific media;

if no logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, attempt to establish a logical ID for the physical ID by causing a Wizard user interface (UI) to be presented to a user via a client computer so that information pertaining to the user's specific media can be collected from the user, wherein different instances of a specific media with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to the same logical ID.

Appellant respectfully reiterates all arguments in favor of allowance of independent claim 47 as made in the Appeal Brief. No admission is made with respect to any assertions put forth within the Examiner's Answer not addressed herein. Appellant, therefore, respectfully submits that the Office fails to establish that the cited prior art references disclose the claimed subject matter for at least the reasons discussed within the Appeal Brief.

Independent claim 56 recites a method of processing media content comprising:

receiving a physical ID that corresponds to a specific CD upon which content resides that can be experienced by a user;

attempting to map the physical ID to a logical ID;

if no logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, attempting to establish a logical ID for the physical ID by causing a user interface (UI) to be

presented to a user via a client computer so that information pertaining to the user's specific media can be collected from the user;

if a logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, searching a database that contains metadata associated with the CD by using the logical ID as a basis for a search query;

formatting the metadata in a XML schema; and
returning the formatted metadata to a client, wherein different instances of a specific CD with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to the same logical ID.

Appellant respectfully reiterates all arguments in favor of allowance of independent claim 56 as made in the Appeal Brief. No admission is made with respect to any assertions put forth within the Examiner's Answer not addressed herein. Appellant, therefore, respectfully submits that the Office fails to establish that the cited prior art references disclose the claimed subject matter for at least the reasons discussed within the Appeal Brief.

Claims 57-60 depend from claim 56 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 56, are neither shown nor suggested by the references of record either singly or in permissible combination with one another.

Independent claim 61 recites a method of processing media content comprising:

receiving a physical ID that corresponds to a specific DVD upon which content resides that can be experienced by a user;

attempting to map the physical ID to a logical ID;

if no logical ID is found that corresponds to the

physical ID, attempting to establish a logical ID for the physical ID by causing a user interface (UI) to be presented to a user via a client computer so that information pertaining to the user's specific media can be collected from the user;

if a logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, searching a database that contains metadata associated with the DVD by using the logical ID as a basis for a search query;

formatting the metadata in a XML schema; and
returning the formatted metadata to a client, wherein different instances of a specific DVD with the same content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to the same logical ID.

Appellant respectfully reiterates all arguments in favor of allowance of independent claim 61 as made in the Appeal Brief. No admission is made with respect to any assertions put forth within the Examiner's Answer not addressed herein. Appellant, therefore, respectfully submits that the Office fails to establish that the cited prior art references disclose the claimed subject matter for at least the reasons discussed within the Appeal Brief.

Claim 62 depends from claim 61 and is allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. This claim is also allowable for its own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 61, are neither shown nor suggested by the references of record either singly or in permissible combination with one another.

Independent claim 69 recites a method of processing media content comprising:

generating a physical ID that corresponds to a specific media upon which content resides that can be experienced by a user on a client computer, wherein different instances of the specific media with the same

content thereon are associated with different physical IDs that are mappable to a same logical ID;

 sending the physical ID to a server configured to return metadata associated with the specific media;

 attempting to map the physical ID to a logical ID;

 if no logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, attempt to establish a logical ID for the physical ID by causing a user interface (UI) to be presented to a user via a client computer so that information pertaining to the user's specific media can be collected from the user;

 if a logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, searching a database that contains metadata associated with the specific media by using the logical ID as a basis for a search query;

 receiving, from the server, XML-formatted metadata;

 parsing, with the client computer, the XML-formatted metadata; and

 displaying the metadata for the user on the client computer.

Appellant respectfully reiterates all arguments in favor of allowance of independent claim 69 as made in the Appeal Brief. No admission is made with respect to any assertions put forth within the Examiner's Answer not addressed herein. Appellant, therefore, respectfully submits that the Office fails to establish that the cited prior art references disclose the claimed subject matter for at least the reasons discussed within the Appeal Brief.

Claims 70 and 71 depend from claim 69 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 69, are neither shown nor suggested by the references of record either singly or in permissible combination with one another.

Claims Rejected Over Jaegar in view of Saganuma

Claims 29-34 and 36-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,553,379 to Jaeger et al. (“Jaeger”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,748 to Saganuma (“Saganuma”).

The Office has introduced new arguments with respect to claims 29-34 and 36-38. *See*, Examiner’s Answer, page 7. Accordingly, Appellant respectfully requests that the application is returned to prosecution so that these new issues may be addressed by the Appellant.

Claims Rejected Over Jaegar in view of Saganuma in further view of Srivastava

Claims 35, 51, and 55 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Jaeger in view of Saganuma, and further in view of Srivastava.

The Office has introduced new arguments with respect to claims 35, 51, and 55. *See*, Office Action, page 10. Accordingly, Appellant respectfully requests that the application is returned to prosecution so that these new issues may be addressed by the Appellant.

Claims Rejected over Milsted

In the Examiner’s Answer, the stated rejections of claims 72-76 similar or the same as those provided in the Non Final Office Action of January 30, 2007. Appellant fully addressed these rejections in Appellant’s Appeal Brief. In the

interest of brevity, Appellant will not repeat Appellant's arguments from the Appeal Brief.

Independent claim 72 recites a method of providing metadata to a client comprising:

establishing a table that contains user-provided entries that map physical IDs to logical IDs, the physical IDs corresponding to specific media upon which content resides that can be experienced by various users, the logical IDs being configured for use in querying one or more databases that contain metadata associated with the specific media, the metadata being returnable to a client;

statistically evaluating the entries to determine, for each physical ID, a most likely logical ID match; and

making the most likely logical ID match available so that it can be used to query the one or more databases.

Appellant respectfully reiterates all arguments in favor of allowance of independent claim 72 as made in the Appeal Brief. No admission is made with respect to any assertions put forth within the Examiner's Answer not addressed herein. Appellant, therefore, respectfully submits that the Office fails to establish that the cited prior art references disclose the claimed subject matter for at least the reasons discussed within the Appeal Brief.

Claim 73 depends from claim 72 and is allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. This claim is also allowable for its own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 72, are neither shown nor suggested by the references of record either singly or in permissible combination with one another.

Independent claim 74 recites a method of providing metadata to a client comprising:

providing a table containing user-provided entries that map physical IDs to logical IDs, the physical IDs corresponding to specific media upon which content resides that can be experienced by various users, the logical IDs being configured for use in querying one or more databases that contain metadata associated with the specific media, the metadata being returnable to a client;

computing, from the table, a list of physical IDs that are to be statistically evaluated;

for each listed physical ID, ascertaining the logical IDs that have been associated with it by users;

computing a distribution of logical IDs for a given physical ID, the distribution describing, for each logical ID, the number of times the physical ID has been mapped thereto;

adding to the distribution, an entry that corresponds to a current trusted logical ID mapping;

weighting the added entry; and

computing, from the distribution, a most likely physical ID to logical ID match.

Appellant respectfully reiterates all arguments in favor of allowance of independent claim 74 as made in the Appeal Brief. No admission is made with respect to any assertions put forth within the Examiner's Answer not addressed herein. Appellant, therefore, respectfully submits that the Office fails to establish that the cited prior art references disclose the claimed subject matter for at least the reasons discussed within the Appeal Brief.

Claims 75 and 76 depend from claim 74 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 74, are neither shown

nor suggested by the references of record either singly or in permissible combination with one another.

Conclusion

For at least the reasons provided above, Appellant respectfully requests that the application is returned to prosecution so that the new issues raised may be addressed by the Appellant. Appellant respectfully requests favorable consideration of this Reply Brief.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC

Dated: August 25, 2008

By: /Kristina M. Kuhnert/

Kristina M. Kuhnert
Reg. No. 62,665
509.324.9256